

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

. PRV 10 . FIGURA 10	THE DIG DATE	FIRST MANCED BUILDINGS	ATTORNEY DOCKETNO	CONFIRMATION NO.
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,357	06/14/2000	Ralf Haferbeck	P00,1277 3957	
75	590 01/11/2005		EXAM	NER
Kevin R Spivak			TSEGAYE, SABA	
Morrison & Fo	erster LLP			
2000 Pennsylvania Avenue NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20006-1888			2662	

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/826,357	HAFERBECK ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Saba Tsegaye	2662			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 24 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice I) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a chiphaces the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dather than the period of extensions of the period of extensions of the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mote patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.			
NOTE:	ation(s):	•			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would		enarate timely filed amendment			
canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	•				
.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme					
10. Other:	SHIM PRIM	OHN PEZZLO JARY EXAMINED			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Application/Control Number: 09/826,357

Art Unit: 2662

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Examiner carefully reviewed Applicant's arguments filed 11/24/04. The arguments are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicant points out the differences between the present invention and the Dempo reference. however, these differences are not in the claim. Examiner believes that the claims, given their broad reasonable interpretation, read on the reference applied. If Applicant wishes an interview, for further clarification, the Applicant is invited to telephone the Examiner.

JOHN PEZZLO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 2